

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/798,652	03/11/2004	Yongjun Guo	3882-P03136US01	6508	
110 DANN DORE	7590 03/09/2007 MAN HERREII & SK	EXAM	EXAMINER		
DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN 1601 MARKET STREET SUITE 2400 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2307			SALMON, KA	SALMON, KATHERINE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1634		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
•			03/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/798,652	GUO, YONGJUN
Examiner	Art Unit
Katherine Salmon	1634

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Katherine Salmon	1634				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>2/12/07</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT	TION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOW	ANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mi	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da ).	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offite of the final rejection,	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as even if timely filed,			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co			coddoo			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,,				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	iected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		,				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ol>			•			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an o	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .		•				
Claim(s) objected to <u>none.</u> Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5,25-28 and 33</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 6-24, 29-32.						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a 🕟			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation</li> </ol>	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration has been consideration.	lored but does NOT place the appli	cation in condition for	r allowance			
because:	iered but does NOT place tile appli	cation in condition for	anowaniec			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13.  Other:		1/1 Marion	\. ().			
	( ) a. Oa MAR	Katherine Salmon	our.			
F	CARLA J. MYERS PRIMARY EXAMINER	Examiner Art Unit				

The reply asserts that the specification discloses the entire sequence of SEQ ID No. 1 and places the sequence in a vector linked to the luicferase gene (p. 8 2nd paragraph). The reply asserts that any sequence can flank SEQ ID No. 1 (p. 8 last full paragraph). The reply asserts that SEQ ID No. 1 can be synthesized from any source and that the examiner has not shown the existence of sources which comprise SEQ ID No. 1 (p. 9 1st paragraph). These arguments have been fully considered but have not been found persuasive.

The term "comprising" in Claim 1 encompasses the sequence with Seq id no. 1 and any flanking sequences on either side of the fragment. This includes splice variants, homologs and mutations as argued in the Final mailed 11/09/2006. Though the specification provides a specific example of the sequence in a vector attached to the luciferase gene, it does not provide adequate description of the large genus of sequence encompassed by the term "comprising". Further these sequences can comprise both naturally and non-naturally occurring sequences. Though these non-naturally occurring sequences may not be found in any databases, these sequences are encompassed by the broad claim language and the specification fails to provide an adequate description of all the potential sequence variations encompassed by the claims.